

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action of August 28, 2007. A Petition for Revival under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is submitted herewith. Claims 1–39 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 25 and 37–39 are amended, Claims 3, 15 and 27 are canceled, and Claims 40–42 are added by this response. No new matter is added.

### I. Objections

The Office Action objected to Claims 3, 10, 15, 22, 27 and 34 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, the Office Action stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of Claim 3. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the features of its base claim and any intervening claims as Claim 40. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 40 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the features of Claim 15. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the features of its base claim and any intervening claims as Claim 41. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 41 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 25 has been amended to include the features of Claim 27. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 25 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 10/763,453

Attorney Docket Number: 304561.02

Filing Date: January 23, 2004

Claim 34 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the features of its base claim and any intervening claims as Claim 42. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 42 is in condition for allowance.

**I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1–2, 4–6, 8–9, 13–14, 16–18, 20–21, 25–26, 28–30, 32–33 and 37–39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,556,704 (“Chen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,852 (“Anandan”). The Office Action rejected Claims 7, 19 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Anandan in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,523 (“Cohen”). The Office Action rejected Claims 11–12, 23–24 and 35–36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Anandan in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,424 (“Allmen”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At least for reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 13 and 25 and their respective dependent claims are each patentably distinguished from Chen in view of Anandan alone or in further view of either Cohen or Allmen and are in condition for allowance.

With respect to Claim 37, Chen discloses a computer image processing method that produces a foreground mask for 2D/3D image editing. However, it is respectfully submitted that Chen does not disclose or suggest a virtual camera being translated with respect to a stereo camera pair to a position determined by a location of a display area of a display device, the location being centered off-center from the center of the display device.

Anandan discloses a process for synthesizing a new image representing a new viewpoint of a scene from at least two existing images of the scene taken from different respective viewpoints. However, it is respectfully submitted that, like Chen, Anandan does not disclose or suggest a virtual camera being translated with respect to a stereo

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 10/763,453

Attorney Docket Number: 304561.02

Filing Date: January 23, 2004

camera pair to a position determined by a location of a display area of a display device, the location being centered off-center from the center of the display device.

For at least the above reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 37 is patentably distinguished from Chen in view of Anandan. For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 38 and 39 are each patentably distinguished from Chen in view of Anadan and are in condition for allowance.

#### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 10/763,453

Attorney Docket Number: 304561.02

Filing Date: January 23, 2004

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: April 18, 2008

By: /MacLane C. Key/

MacLane C. Key, Reg. No.: 48250  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (703) 647-6566  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

April 18, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111  
Application Number: 10/763,453  
Attorney Docket Number: 304561.02  
Filing Date: January 23, 2004